

### **REMARKS**

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on December 13, 2005.

Claim 1 is amended. Claims 23-31 are added. As a result, claims 1-13 and 23-31 are now pending in this application.

#### **Objection to the Claims**

Claim 1 was objected to due to informalities. It is believed that the amendment made herein to claim 1 obviates the objection.

#### **§103 Rejection of the Claims**

**Claims 1 and 5-10 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rai et al. (U.S. 4,818,728, hereinafter Rai) in view of Wei et al. (U.S. 5,703,394, hereinafter Wei).**

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reason presented below.

Claim 1 is amended and recites, among other things, that the one or more second bond pads “directly contacting” the one or more spacers.

Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable over Rai and Wei because Applicant cannot find a motivation to combine Rai and Wei as proposed by the Office Action.

Applicant also believes that claim 1 is patentable over Rai and Wei because Applicant is unable to find in Rai and Wei everything recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Rai and Wei, whether considered individually or in combination, the one or more second bond pads “directly contacting” the one or more spacers. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1.

Dependent claims 5-10 depend from claim 1 and recite the things of claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 5-10 are also patentable over Rai and Wei, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, plus the additional things recited in claims 5-10. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 5-10.

**Claims 1-9 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiStefano et al. (U.S. 5,891,446, hereinafter DiStefano) in view of Wei.**

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reason presented below.

Claim 1 is amended and recites, among other things, that the one or more second bond pads “directly contacting” the one or more spacers.

Applicant believes that claim 1 is patentable over DiStefano and Wei because Applicant cannot find a motivation to combine DiStefano and Wei as proposed by the Office Action.

Applicant also believes that claim 1 is patentable over Rai and Wei because Applicant is unable to find in DiStefano and Wei everything recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in DiStefano and Wei, whether considered individually or in combination, the one or more second bond pads “directly contacting” the one or more spacers. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and recite the things of claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 2-9 are also patentable over DiStefano and Wei, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, plus the additional things recited in claims 2-9. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 2-9.

**Claims 10-13 were also rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DiStefano in view of Wei and further in view of Marrs (U.S. 5,795,818).**

Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reason presented below.

Dependent claims 10-13 depend from independent claim 1 and recite the things of claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that claims 10-13 are also patentable over DiStefano, Wei, and Marrs, whether considered individually or in combination, for at least the reasons presented above regarding claim 1, plus the additional things recited in claims 10-13. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 10-13.

*New Claims*

Applicant believes that new claims 23-31 are patentable over the cited patents because Applicant cannot find in the cited patents everything recited in independent claim 23 and everything recited in each of the dependent claims 24-31. For example, Applicant cannot find in the cited patents: placing at least one spacer on at least one first bond pad of a first circuit board such that “the spacer directly contacts the first bond pad”, and aligning the first circuit board with the second circuit board by engaging the spacer with an opening in the second circuit board so that a second bond pad of the second circuit board aligns with the first bond pad and so that “the spacer directly contacts the second bond pad”. Accordingly, Applicant requests consideration and allowance of claims 23-31.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6969) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,


ROBERT C. SUNDAHL ET AL.

By their Representatives,  
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 349-9592

Date

13 April 2006

By

  
Viet V. Tong

Reg. No. 45,416

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 13th day of April, 2006.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

